ORIGINA



## ARIZONA WATER COMPANYEIVED

3805 N. BLACK CANYON HIGHWAY, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85015-5351 • P.O. BOX 29006, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85038-9006
PHONE: (602) 240-6860 • FAX: (602) 240-6878 • WWW.AZWATARA 29 [ 2 ] : 58

October 29, 2004

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Mr. Ernest G. Johnson, Esq., Director Utilities Division Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85007

DOCKETED BY

OCT 2 9 2004

Re: Response To Staff Report (Docket No. W-01445-04-0498)

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The Commission Staff issued its Staff Report in this matter on October 4, 2004. The Staff Report recommends issuing an accounting order authorizing the Company to defer arsenic treatment costs incurred in its Western Group for future Commission consideration for recovery as summarized below:

- 1. Deferral of depreciation expense for the actual cost to purchase each arsenic treatment facility for a period not to exceed twelve months.
- 2. Deferral of the actual lease capital costs (standby fee) for each leased arsenic treatment facility for a period not to exceed twelve months.
- 3. Eligibility to defer leased capital costs is contingent upon meeting the following criteria:
- a. The lease payment must segregate the lessor's equipment construction costs, recoverable O&M costs defined as media replacement or regeneration costs, media replacement or regeneration service costs and waste media or regeneration disposal costs, and the lessor's embedded interest rate.
- 4. Operation and Maintenance expenses are limited to recoverable O&M expenses defined above.
  - 5. Property taxes associated with arsenic treatment plant are not eligible for deferral.
  - 6. No deferrals shall be recorded after January 2007.

E-MAIL: mail@azwater.com

## ARIZONA WATER COMPANY

To: Mr. Ernest Johnson

October 29, 2004

Re: Response To Staff Report (Docket No. W-01445-04-0498)

Page 2

The Staff and Company agree on the need for an Accounting Order authorizing the Company to defer arsenic treatment costs incurred in its Western Group for future consideration of recovery by the Commission. However, the Company strongly disagrees with the deferral methodology Staff recommends and its perverse effects which unfairly reduce the Company's arsenic treatment facility ratebase while also increasing the amount of ACRM revenue that customers will have to pay. I am bringing this to your attention for reconsideration because I do not believe the Commission would knowingly choose such an outcome.

The Company is not requesting a hearing on this matter. The time to prepare testimony, participate in a hearing and then assist in the preparation of briefs would take more time than the Company can reasonably devote to this matter at the present time. Therefore to save time and legal expenses the Company requests that its objections be considered without a hearing.

The ACRM in effect for the Northern and Eastern Groups permits the Company to file for recovery of arsenic treatment facility capital costs as soon as the facility is placed in service. However all of the Western Group arsenic treatment facility capital costs will be incurred before an ACRM can even be authorized as part of the Company's pending rate application. Although no return will be earned on the purchased arsenic treatment facility capital costs until the first Western group ACRM filing is approved & becomes effective, the Company has not requested a deferred return or deprecation expense. In its Application the Company simply requested that the purchase cost of arsenic treatment facilities be deferred until the first ACRM filing. This approach preserves the Company's investment until an ACRM filing is made and produces a lower ACRM revenue requirement.

Staff differs with the Company and instead recommends that depreciation expense, but not a return on the investment, be deferred beginning with the in-service date of the arsenic treatment facility. Staff supports its alternative position with a fallacious accounting argument asserting that "The Company's proposal to record purchased arsenic treatment facilities in a deferred debit account effectively provides for authorization of recovery, not simply deferral for future consideration of recovery." This assertion contradicts the plain language of the Uniform System of Accounts. For example, the 1996 USOA discussion of A/C 186 Miscellaneous deferred debits includes the following language regarding Regulatory Assets:

C. "If rate recovery of all or part of the amount included in this account is disallowed, then the disallowed amount..." (emphasis added)

The more general category of items charged to the account as described on page 73 A. is "... items the final disposition of which is uncertain." The Company's proposal deferring only the purchase cost or lease capital costs does not provide authorization of recovery as a reading of the USOA clearly states. More importantly, the Commission's eventual ratemaking treatment of an item is certainly not constrained by the original accounting.

The deferral methodology recommended by Staff penalizes both the Company and ratepayers. The effects of the Company and Staff deferral methodology over the period from

## ARIZONA WATER COMPANY

To: Mr. Ernest Johnson October 29, 2004

Re: Response To Staff Report (Docket No. W-01445-04-0498) Page 3

January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2009 are compared on the enclosed Exhibit 1. Both sets of calculations are based on the following set of realistic assumptions:

- \$13.6 million of purchased arsenic treatment facilities are placed in service January 2005.
- The first Western Group ACRM filing is effective January 2006.
- The Western Group participates in a Company-wide general rate case application based on test year 2006 that is filed September 2007 with new rates becoming effective January 2009.

The Company's methodology (illustrated on the left side of Exhibit 1) records the purchase cost of the arsenic treatment facilities in a deferred debit account as shown on line 1 and does not recognize depreciation or a return until the first ACRM becomes effective. Staff's deferral methodology (illustrated on the right side of Exhibit 1), which was confirmed in a meeting with Staff on October 26, begins recording depreciation but not a return as soon as the arsenic treatment facilities are placed in service as shown on line 1, Exhibit 1. Since the accumulated depreciation is not being recovered through the rates, the expense portion of the depreciation is recorded in a deferred debit account for future recovery.

The initial effects of these differing deferral methodologies are apparent at the time the first ACRM filing becomes effective as shown on line 13 of Exhibit 1. Under its proposal the Company has a ratebase of \$13,600,000, which results in an initial monthly revenue requirement of \$193,373. In contrast, the Staff's ratebase is \$13,211,040 or \$388,960 less and the initial monthly revenue requirement is \$211,183, 14.4% more than under the Company's proposal. This rather perverse result occurs because of the deferral of depreciation rather than plant. The \$388,960 deferred debit that appears on line 13 under Staff's methodology must be amortized (expensed). The required amortization of \$32,413 per month directly increases the Staff ACRM revenue requirement.

Staff's proposed methodology unnecessarily increases customers' rates and lowers the Company's return as illustrated on Exhibit 1. This is true whether measured on a discounted present value basis as shown at the top of the Exhibit or just a straight accumulation over the 60-month period as illustrated at the bottom of the Exhibit. The Company provided written comments and met with the Staff to discuss its analysis comparing the effects of the two positions in an attempt to reach an agreement on the deferral methodology. Although Staff confirmed that the analysis correctly depicted their recommended methodology, they did not provide any other direct comments on the analysis. Unfortunately no agreement was reached. Therefore I request you to review the record in this matter and reconsider the effects of Staff's deferral methodology on the Company and its customers.

## ARIZONA WATER COMPANY

To: Mr. Ernest Johnson

Re: Response To Staff Report (Docket No. W-01445-04-0498)

October 29, 2004

Page 4

Very truly yours,

Ralph J. Kennedy

Vice President and Treasurer

Gel & / Curredy

jrc

Enclosure

\$180,592 \$184,051 \$187,180																																																						
\$8,373,500 \$8,086,785 \$7,775,916	Revenue	equirement								Increases Customer's Rates	/	/	<b>#</b> ?	221,183	221.183	221,183	221,183	221,183	221,183	221,183	221,183	21,183	221.183	188,769	188,769	188,769	188 769	188,769	188,769	188,769 188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188.769	188,769	188,769	188,769	188,769	184 550	184,550	184,550	184,550	184,550	184,550	184,550	184,550	184,550 184,550	970 206	3,533,450
	Amortize	Deferred Dr Requirement	_	_	_					Increases Cus		,	¥ 25 55	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	,	•			•	•		•	•	•		•	ı	•		•	į	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•		i	•			•	
	epreciation	2.86%					/ ion Must Bo	ates	}/	/	/	/	6	32.413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32.413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	! Î	
	Return @ Gross Returr Depreciation	1.63245					Ted Denrecia	Collected Through The Rates	, ,				458 258	156.356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	150,350	156,350	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156.356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156.356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	156,356	152,136	152,136	152,136	152, 130	152,138	152,136	152,136	152,136 152,136	152,136	7 454 458	
	Return @ Gr	8.70%					Staff's Defer	Collected Tr					05.780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	90,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95.780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	95,780	93,780	93,195	93, 195	93,195	55, 55 195	93,195	93,195	93, 195	93,195 93,105	93, 195	!	
	Adjustred	Rate Base			_		_	_				_	13 211 040	13,178,627	13,146,213	13,113,800	13,081,387	13,048,973	13,016,560	12,964,147	12.919.320	12,886,907	12,854,493	12,822,080	12,789,667	12,724,840	12,692,427	12,660,013	12,627,600	12,562,773	12,530,360	12,497,947	12,465,533	12,400,707	12,368,293	12,335,880	12,303,467	12,238,640	12,206,227	12,173,813	12,141,400	12,108,987	12.854.493											
	Accumulatec	Depreciation	32,413	64,827	97,240	129,653	194.480	226,893	259,307	291,720	324,133	356,547	388 960	421,373	453,787	486,200	518,613	720,155	563,440	648.287	680,680	713,093	745,507	777,920	842 747	875,160	907,573	939,987	1 004 813	1,037,227	1,069,640	1,102,053	1,134,467	1 199,293	1,231,707	1,264,120	1,296,533	1,361,360	1,393,773	1,426,187	1,458,600		840		1,620,667	1,653,080	1717.907	1,750,320	1,782,733	1,815,147	1,847,560	1,912,387		
		Service											13.600.000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13 600 000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,500,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13.600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000	13,600,000		
	Deferred	Debit	32,413	64,827	97,240	162 067	194,480	226,893	259,307	291,720	324,133	388.967												0		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	,	•	•	•	•	•		•	, ,	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				
\$8,192,908 \$7,882,734 \$7,588,735	Revenue	Reduirement						mer Rafes		_	_	<b>,</b>	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,3/3	193,373	193.373	193.373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193.373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193.373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	193,373	189,153	189,153	189,153	189,153	189,153	189,153	189,153	189,153	189,153 189,153	189,153	9,231,261	
8 67 67	<u>5</u>	6.00%						Lower Customer Rates					32,413	32,413	32,413	52,473	32,413	32.413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32.413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32.413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	37.413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413	32,413		
		1.05240									,	1	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	160,960	156,740	156,740	156,740	156.740	156,740	156,740	156,740	156,740	156,740	156,740	7,675,421	
	Return @ Gross Return D								,	y Ketum	<u>/</u> -		009'86	98,600	98,600	98,900	000,000	98.600	009'86	009'86	98,600	98,600	98,600	009,88	98,600	98,600	98,600	98,600	98,600	98,600	98,600	98,98	98,600	98,600	009	96,900	98,600	98,600	98,600	08,600	000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 00	98,600	96,015	96,015	96,015	96,015	96,015	96,015	96,015	96,015	96,015 96,015	'		
7. V. Kate 6.0% 10.0%	Adjustred F									Higher Company Ketum			000,000	13,567,587	5,535,173	13,502,760	13.437.933	13,405,520	13,373,107	3,340,693	13,308,280	13,275,867	13,243,453	178 627	13,146,213	3,113,800	3,081,387	016.560	12,984,147	12,951,733	,919,320	12,886,907	12,822,080	12,789,667	12,757,253	12,724,840	12.660.013	12,627,600	12,595,187	12,562,773	497 947	465,533	13,243,453										Total	
_	Accumulatec A								-	<b></b>							•	•							453,787 1:								-				-	•					1,166,880		1,231,707	296,533	,328,947	,361,360	1,393,773	426,187	,436,800 1,491,013	,523,427	F	
Present Value Of Revenue Requirement: Shown On Lines 13 Through 60	Plant in Ac	1											,600,000	13,600,000	900,000	000,000	900,000	000,009	,600,000	000'009'	,600,000	000,000	000,000	000,000	900,000	000'009'	900,000	000,000	000 009	000'009'	000,000	000,000	900,000	,600,000	900,000	900,000	000,009	000'009'	000,009	000'009'	900,000	000,009	13,600,000	000,009	900,000	000,000	900,009	000,009	13,600,000	000,000	13,600,000	000,000		
sent Value Of Shown On Lin	Deferred	, 	13,600,000										(13,600,000) 13	₽ ;	5 5	2 6	50	5	₽	₽ P	₽	₽ ;	5 6	<u>.</u> €	. <del>E</del>	₽:	₽ <b>\$</b>	5 E	. ₹2	₽ :	±5 ±	5 6	. 6	₽.	₽ ₽	3 &	, <del>E</del>	ŧ	₽ ;	₽ ₽	3 E	2 22	#	<b>₽</b>	5 5	3 53	₽	₽ ;	₽ <b>\$</b>	22 €	; <del>E</del>	5		
G B	Line	1	13	N 67	4	2	91	~ 0	<b>20</b> C	» <del>C</del>	: =			<b>4</b> ;	υ <del>έ</del>	2 12	: 22	19	8	73	23	ខ	<b>4</b> %	8 8	72	88	ද ද	8 8	83	8	<b>3</b> 18	8 %	37	æ	8 8	3 4	4	<del>5</del>	4 :	₹ 4	\$ <del>7</del>	8	6	ନ୍ତ :	ភេជ	8 K	28	ß (	2 82	<b>%</b> ત	88	8		
	Month		Jan-05	Mar-05	Apr-05	May-05	Jun-05	A. 60	Soo o	0 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Nov-05	Dec-05	Jan-06	Feb-06	Apr-06	May-06	Jun-08	3ul-06	Aug-08	Sep-06	90to	Nov-06	20.00	Feb-07	Mar-07	Apr-07	May-07	70-Inc	Aug-07	Sep-07	Cg-04	Dec-07	Jan-08	Feb-08	Mar-08	May-08	Jun-08	Jul-08	Aug-08	8 6	Nov-08	Dec-08	Jan-09	Feb-09	Mar-09	May-09	Jun-09	60-jn (	Aug-09	8 6	Nov-09	Dec-09		
	•												ACRM #1									ļ	<u>.</u>							GRC Filed												Decision	New Rates	ate Base	30/LS/ZL &									